

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

KENNETH E. CALLIES,

Defendant and Appellant.

D047843

(Super. Ct. No. SCD194526)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Charles G. Rogers, Judge. Affirmed.

Kenneth E. Callies entered a negotiated guilty plea to failing to register as a sex offender. (Pen. Code, § 290, subd. (g)(2).) The court suspended imposition of sentence and placed him on probation for three years, including a condition he serve 180 days in custody with no credit for time served and ordered him to pay a \$239 fine, a \$200 restitution fine, a second \$200 restitution fine suspended until completion of parole, a \$20

court security fee, and \$570 for his court appointed attorney. The record does not include a certificate of probable cause. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 30(b).)

DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief setting forth the evidence in the superior court. Counsel presents no argument for reversal but asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to as possible but not arguable issues: (1) whether the trial court erred in failing to award presentence custody credit; (2) whether Callies was properly advised he would be ordered to pay fines and fees; and (3) whether Callies was required to register as a sex offender even though he was homeless.¹

We granted Callies permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded. A review of the entire record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, including the possible issues referred to pursuant to *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issue. Competent counsel has represented Callies on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ Because Callies entered a guilty plea, he cannot challenge the facts underlying the conviction. (Pen. Code, § 1237.5; *People v. Martin* (1973) 9 Cal.3d 687, 693.) We need not recite the facts.

HALLER, J.

WE CONCUR:

HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.

McINTYRE, J.